

structure, personnel, and telephone numbers remain the same.

**ADDRESSES:** The mailing address for airline submissions is Data Administration Division, K-25, Rm 4125, Office of Airline Information, BTS, Department of Transportation, 400 7th Street, SW, Washington, DC 20590-0001 (Telephone 202-366-9059).

Dated: June 14, 1995.

**Philip N. Fulton,**

*Associate Director for Data User Services.*

[FR Doc. 95-15008 Filed 6-19-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-60-P

## Coast Guard

[CGD 95-050]

### New York Harbor Traffic Management Advisory Committee; Meeting

**AGENCY:** Coast Guard, DOT.

**ACTION:** Notice of meeting.

**SUMMARY:** A meeting of the New York Harbor Traffic Management Advisory Committee (NYHTMAC) will be held on July 12, 1995. Topics for this meeting include a report on upcoming marine events, dredging operations in New York Harbor, update on Vessel Traffic Service and Coast Guard regulatory initiatives, environmental monitoring initiatives, committee business, and topics from the floor.

**DATES:** The meeting will be held at 10 a.m. on July 12, 1995.

**ADDRESSES:** The meeting will be held in the Conference Room, second floor, U.S. Coast Guard Marine Inspection Office, Battery Park, New York.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Lieutenant Commander D.S. HILL, USCG, NYHTMAC Executive Secretary, Vessel Traffic Service New York, Building 108, Governors Island, New York, NY 10004-5070; or by calling (212) 668-7429.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Authority for conducting NYHTMAC meetings is granted pursuant to section 10(a)(2) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (Pub. L. 92-463; 5 USC App. I).

The New York Harbor Traffic Management Advisory Committee has been established by Commander, First Coast Guard District to provide information, consultation, and advice with regard to port development, maritime trade, port traffic, and other maritime interests in the harbor. Members of the Committee serve voluntarily without compensation from the Federal Government.

Topics for this meeting include a report on upcoming marine events,

dredging operations in New York Harbor, update on Vessel Traffic Service and Coast Guard regulatory initiatives, environmental monitoring initiatives, committee business, and topics from the floor.

Attendance is open to the interested public. With advance notice to the Chairperson, members of the public may make oral statements at the meeting. Persons wishing to present oral statements should notify the Executive Director no later than one day before the meeting. Any member of the public may present a written statement to the Committee at any time.

The New York Harbor Traffic Management Advisory Committee continues to seek additional members who represent the many diverse interests in the Port of New York and New Jersey.

Dated: June 6, 1995.

**T.H. Gilmour,**

*Captain, U.S. Coast Guard, Captain of the Port New York, NYHTMAC Executive Director.*

[FR Doc. 95-15079 Filed 6-19-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-14-M

[CGD 95-047]

### National Environmental Policy Act: Agency Procedures for Categorical Exclusions

**AGENCY:** Coast Guard, DOT.

**ACTION:** Notice of agency policy.

**SUMMARY:** The Coast Guard is announcing two changes in its policy concerning agency actions that are categorically excluded from additional environmental analysis under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). One change concerns the need for an environmental analysis checklist in the development of drawbridge regulations and procedures. The other change concerns permits for sailing competitions and demonstrations.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Mr. David Reese, Environmental Compliance and Restoration Branch, (202) 267-1942.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

##### Background

Under regulations implementing the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) (40 CFR parts 1500 through 1508), each Federal agency is required to adopt procedures to supplement those regulations (40 CFR 1507.3). The Coast Guard's procedures and policies are published as a Commandant instruction entitled "National Environmental Policy Act Implementing

Procedures and Policy for Considering Environmental Impacts" (COMDTINST M1675.1B). On July 29, 1994, the Coast Guard published a notice in the **Federal Register** (59 FR 38654) announcing the revision of section 2.B.2 of the instruction. Section 2.B.2 lists the proposed agency actions that are categorically excluded from the requirement that the actions undergo the analysis that accompanies preparation of an Environmental Assessment or Environmental Impact Statement.

#### Discussion of Changes

(1) The Coast Guard has determined that the requirement under section 2.B.2.e.(32)(e) of COMDTINST M16475.1B (as published in 59 FR 38658; July 29, 1994) to prepare an environmental analysis checklist should not apply to the promulgation of operating regulations or procedures for drawbridges. A checklist is an internal administrative document devised by the Coast Guard to assist in analyzing agency actions that might have a significant effect on the human environment. After numerous cases, the Coast Guard has found that these actions are not likely to have a significant effect on the human environment. Therefore, the Coast Guard is removing the words "(Checklist required)." from section 2.B.2.e.(32)(e). This removal has no effect on the Coast Guard's responsibility to consider the effects of its actions on the human environment.

(2) Section 2.B.2.e.(35)(c) is corrected to refer to sailing competitions or demonstrations involving approximately "100 sailboats or sailboards," not "100 sailboats or sailboards."

For the reasons set out in the preamble, the Coast Guard announces the following amendments to section 2.B.2.e. of COMDTINST M 16475.1B:

#### 2.B.2.e. Categorical Exclusion List

(32) \* \* \*

\* \* \* \* \*

(e) Promulgation of operating regulations or procedures for drawbridges.

\* \* \* \* \*

(35) \* \* \*

\* \* \* \* \*

(c) Sailing competitions or demonstrations involving approximately 100 sailboats (up to approximately 26 feet in length) or sailboards and not more than approximately 200 spectator craft.

\* \* \* \* \*

Dated: June 13, 1995.

**E. J. Barrett,**

*Rear Admiral, U.S. Coast Guard, Chief, Office of Engineering, Logistics and Development.*

[FR Doc. 95-15078 Filed 6-19-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-14-M

## **Federal Aviation Administration**

### **[Change to AC No. 120-42A]**

#### **Proposed Appendix 7, Reduction of Operator's Inservice Experience Requirement Prior to the Granting of an ETOPS Operational Approval [Accelerated ETOPS Operational Approval], to Advisory Circular 120-42A, Extended Range Operation with Two-Engine Airplanes (ETOPS)**

#### **Correction**

In notice document 95-13403 beginning on page 28643 in the issue of Thursday, June 1, 1995, Appendix 7 of Advisory Circular 120-42A was inadvertently not published in the original document. Appendix 7 of Advisory Circular 120-42A reads as follows:

#### **Appendix 7: Reduction of Operator's in Service Experience Requirement Prior to the Granting of ETOPS Operational Approval (Accelerated ETOPS Operational Approval)**

##### **1. General**

a. Paragraph 9(b) of AC 120-42A states the following:

(1) (In service experience) guidelines may be reduced or increased following review and concurrence on a case-by-case basis by the Director, Flight Standards Service.

(2) Any reduction \* \* \* will be based on evaluation of the operators ability and competence to achieve the necessary reliability for the particular airframe/engine combination in extended range operations.

(3) For example, a reduction in inservice experience may be considered for an operator who can show extensive inservice experience with a related engine on another airplane which has achieved acceptable reliability.

(4) The substitution of in service experience which is equivalent to the actual conduct of 120-minute ETOPS operations will also be established by the Director, Flight Standards Service AFS-1, on a case by case basis.

b. The purpose of this appendix is to establish the factors which the Director, Flight Standards Service may consider in exercising the authority to allow reduction or substitution of operators inservice experience requirement in granting ETOPS Operational Approval.

c. Paragraph 7 of AC 120-42A states that \* \* \* the concepts for evaluating extended range operations with two-engine airplanes \* \* \* ensure that two-engine airplanes are consistent with the level of safety required for current extended range operations with three and four-engine turbine powered airplanes without unnecessarily restricting operation.

d. It is apparent that the excellent propulsion related safety record of two-engine airplanes has not only been maintained, but potentially enhanced, by the process related provisions associated with ETOPS Type Design and Operational Approvals. Further, currently available data shows that these process related benefits are achievable without extensive inservice experience. Therefore, reduction or elimination of inservice experience requirements may be possible when the operator shows to the FAA that adequate and validated ETOPS processes are in place.

e. The Accelerated ETOPS Operations Approval Program with reduced inservice does not imply that any reduction of existing levels of safety should be tolerated but rather acknowledges that an operator may be able to satisfy the objectives of AC 120-42A by a variety of means of demonstrating that operator's capability.

f. This Appendix permits an operator to start ETOPS operations when the operator has demonstrated to the FAA that those processes necessary for successful ETOPS operations are in place and are considered to be reliable. This may be achieved by thorough documentation of processes, demonstration on another airplane/ validation (as described in paragraph 7 of this Appendix) or a combination of these.

##### **2. Background**

a. When AC 120-42 was first released in 1985 ETOPS was a new concept, requiring extensive inservice verification of capability to assure the concept was a logical approach. At that time, the FAA recognized that reduction in the inservice experience requirements or substitution of inservice experience, on another airplane, would be possible.

b. The ETOPS concept has been successfully applied for close to a decade; ETOPS is now widely employed. The number of ETOPS operators has increased dramatically, and in the North Atlantic U.S. airlines have more twin operations than the number of operations accomplished by three and four engine airplanes. ETOPS is now well established.

c. Under AC 120-42A, an operator was generally required to operate an airframe-engine combination for one (1) year, before being eligible for 120-minute ETOPS; and another one (1) year, at 120-minute ETOPS, before being granted 180-minute ETOPS approval. For example, an operator who currently has 180-minute ETOPS approval on one type of airframe-engine or who is currently operating that route with an older generation three or four engine airplane was required to wait for up to two (2) years for such an approval. Such a requirement could create undue economic burden on operators, while not contributing materially to safety. Data indicates that compliance with processes has resulted in successful ETOPS operation at earlier than the standard time provided for in the advisory circular.

d. ETOPS operational data indicates that twins have maintained a high degree of reliability due to implementation of specific maintenance, engineering and flight operation process related requirements. Compliance with ETOPS processes is crucial in assuring high levels of reliability of twins. Data shows that previous experience on an airframe-engine combination prior to operating ETOPS, does not necessarily make a significant difference in the safety of such operations. Commitment to establishment of reliable ETOPS processes has been found to be a much more significant factor. Such commitment, by operators, to ETOPS processes has, from the outset, resulted in operation of twins at a mature level of reliability.

e. ETOPS experience of the past decade shows that a firm commitment by the operator to establish proven ETOPS processes prior to the start of actual ETOPS operations and to maintain that commitment throughout the life of the program is paramount to ensuring safe and reliable ETOPS operations.

##### **3. Definitions**

a. *Process.* A process is a series of steps or activities that are accomplished, in a consistent manner, to assure that a desired result is attained on an ongoing basis. Paragraph 4 documents ETOPS processes that should be in place to ensure a successful Accelerated ETOPS program.

b. *Proven Process.* A process is considered to be proven when the following elements are developed and implemented:

(1) Definition and documentation of process elements.